

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached Drawing sheet includes a change to Fig. 1 and replaces the original Drawing sheet with Fig. 1 thereon. In Fig. 1, the previously omitted Legend "PRIOR ART" has been added.

Attachment: 1 replacement sheet

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 28 June 2005. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1-3 have been amended to correct the language thereof and Claim 17 has been amended to clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the subject Patent Application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawing of Fig. 1 because such should be designated with the Legend "PRIOR ART". Accordingly, a corrected formal Drawing of Fig. 1 is attached hereto. The corrected formal Drawing includes the Legend "PRIOR ART".

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Title as not being descriptive and required a new Title. Accordingly, the Title has been amended to -- STRUCTURE OF A LIQUID CRYSTAL ON SILICON DISPLAY HAVING REFLECTORS --. It is believed that the new Title is clearly indicative of the claimed invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the claimed "pixel electrode" was identified in the Specification in such a way that its use is contrary to the "term of art" meaning of the term.

The Claims have been amended to remove the term “pixel” from the description of the element which corresponds to element 214 described in the Specification. The structure is now simply defined as an electrode, to avoid conflict with the conventional term of art.


In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Nakamura, et al., U.S. Patent 6,124,911. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner further noted that Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 16 therein, thereby placing Claim 17 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 16, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Claim 18 is now dependent upon an allowable base claim. Additionally, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome and therefore Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 should now be allowable. Still further, it is believed that Claims 2, 6 and 8-15 are dependent upon a generic base claim, and therefore should also be allowed.

MR2707-52  
Serial Number: 10/733,277  
Reply to Office Action dated 28 June 2005

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David I. Klein". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and registration number.

David I. Klein  
Registration #33,253

Dated: 27 Sept. 2005

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678  
Customer No. 04586